

NON COMMUTATIVE TOPOLOGY AND LOCAL STRUCTURE OF OPERATOR ALGEBRAS

MASSOUD AMINI

ABSTRACT. Starting with a W^* -algebra M we use the inverse system obtained by cutting down M by its (central) projections to define an inverse limit of W^* -algebras, and show that how this pro- W^* -algebra encodes the local structure of M . For the C^* -algebras we do the same thing using their atomic enveloping W^* -algebras. We investigate the relation of these ideas to the Akemann-Giles-Kummer non commutative topology. Finally we use these ideas to look at the local structure of Kac algebras.

1. INTRODUCTION

The main motivation of this work is a hope to use the *projective limits* as a device to explain some of the features of the local theory of non compact quantum groups. However, since the theory of locally compact quantum groups is in its beginning [KV], one could not test the applicability of these ideas quite clearly. Kac algebras were understood as an appropriate model to generalize the duality of locally compact topological groups inside one category. They also provide a solid framework for quantum groups. They have, however, two shortcomings. One is the fact that in this theory one assumes (and not *prove*) the existence of the *Haar measure*. The other is that we don't know enough *nontrivial* examples of Kac algebras. But they have some advantages also, the most important one being the fact that they have a well established theory. In this paper we use the projective limits of W^* -algebras to study the *local* structure of Kac algebras. We start with doing the same thing for an arbitrary W^* -algebra and then to adapt the machinery to C^* -algebras. In particular we study the topological algebra of the elements which *locally* belong to the underlying W^* -algebra. We also use the Pedersen's ideal and its multiplier algebra to make connections with the already well investigated theory of non commutative topology.

2. PRO- W^* -ALGEBRAS

In the beginning of this section we follow [Frg] to give a general overview of the *projective limits* of W^* -algebras (For pro- C^* -algebras see [Ph88 a-c] and references there in). Then we prove some new results which are needed in the next section. M is called a pro- W^* -algebra if $M = \varprojlim_{\alpha} M_{\alpha}$ is an inverse (projective) limit of W^* -algebras. We denote the corresponding morphisms of the inverse system with

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 46L05; Secondary 18A25, 46M15.

Key words and phrases. pro- W^* -algebras, Pedersen's ideal, multiplier algebra, non commutative topology, Kac algebras.

* Supported by an IPM grant.

$\pi_{\alpha\beta} : M_\beta \rightarrow M_\alpha$, and $\pi_\alpha : M \rightarrow M_\alpha$ which satisfy $\pi_{\alpha\beta}\pi_{\beta\gamma} = \pi_{\alpha\gamma}$ and $\pi_{\alpha\beta}\pi_\beta = \pi_\alpha$ for each $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma$.

If $M = \varprojlim_\alpha M_\alpha$ is a pro- W^* -algebra, then it is a projective limit and $M = \varprojlim_\alpha \pi_\alpha(M)$. Let's denote the norm and weak operator topologies of M_α with τ_α and σ_α , respectively. Then M has the *projective topology* $\tau = \varprojlim_\alpha \tau_\alpha$. Also if $\pi_{\alpha\beta}$'s are normal (equivalently *weak**-continuous), then we can endow M with the *σ -weak projective topology* $\sigma = \varprojlim_\alpha \sigma_\alpha$ which is *coarser* than τ . In this case we have

$$(M, \sigma) = \varprojlim_\alpha cl_{\sigma_\alpha}(\pi_\alpha(M)) = \varprojlim_\alpha (M_\alpha, \sigma_\alpha).$$

Also each σ -closed $*$ -subalgebra of a pro- W^* -algebra is a pro- W^* -algebra. We are mostly interested in the case where the morphisms $\pi_{\alpha\beta}$'s are normal and surjective.

Three immediate examples of pro- W^* -algebras are as follows. Let (M_α) be a *descending* chain of W^* -algebras such that the relative norm and weak topologies are compatible, when restricted appropriately. Then

$$\cap_\alpha M_\alpha = \varprojlim_\alpha M_\alpha$$

is a (possibly trivial!) pro- W^* -algebra. In this case the morphism $\pi_{\alpha\beta} : M_\beta \rightarrow M_\alpha$ is simply the inclusion map which is normal (by assumption on topologies) but not surjective in general.

Also for each directed net (M_α) of W^* -algebras $\prod_\alpha M_\alpha$ is a pro- W^* -algebra. Indeed

$$\prod_\alpha M_\alpha \simeq \varprojlim_\alpha \left(\sum_{\beta \leq \alpha} \bigoplus M_\beta \right).$$

In this case $\pi_{\alpha\beta} : \sum_{\lambda \leq \beta} M_\lambda \rightarrow \sum_{\lambda \leq \alpha} M_\lambda$ is just the projection onto a direct summand which is obviously normal.

The third example is the most important, since it provides a *universal* pro- W^* -algebra. Let (H_α) be a *ascending* chain of Hilbert spaces (i.e. $H_\alpha \subseteq H_\beta$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\alpha = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\beta$ on H_α for $\alpha \leq \beta$). Then $H = \varinjlim_\alpha H_\alpha$ with the canonical *inductive topology* is called a *locally Hilbert space* [Ino]. Note that H is *not* a Hilbert space in general (it is a Hilbert space if there is a maximal element for the chain). Let $\iota_{\alpha\beta} : H_\alpha \rightarrow H_\beta$ be the canonical injection, and define

$$\mathcal{L}(H) = \{T \in L(H) : T_\beta \circ \iota_{\alpha\beta} = \iota_{\alpha\beta} T_\alpha\}$$

where $T_\alpha \in B(H_\alpha)$ is the restriction of T to H_α . Then $\mathcal{L}(H) = \varprojlim_\alpha B(H_\alpha)$ is a pro- W^* -algebra and the morphisms $\pi_{\alpha\beta} : B(H_\beta) \rightarrow B(H_\alpha)$ are normal surjections. We endow $\mathcal{L}(H)$ with the σ -weak projective topology $\sigma = \varprojlim_\alpha \sigma_\alpha$, where $\sigma_\alpha = \sigma(B(H_\alpha), K(H_\alpha)^*)$. As an example, if $H_n = \mathbb{C}^n$ ($n \geq 1$), then $\mathcal{L}(H)$ is just the algebra of all infinite upper triangular matrices.

The pro- W^* -algebra $\mathcal{L}(H)$ could be used to give a *representation theorem* for pro- W^* -algebra which is analogue to the corresponding result for W^* -algebras. This result asserts that every pro- W^* -algebra with the σ -weak projective topology is (isomorphic, as topological algebras, to) a σ -weakly closed $*$ -subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}(H)$, for some locally Hilbert space H . Indeed, if $M = \varprojlim_\alpha M_\alpha$ is a pro- W^* -algebra with faithful weak operator continuous representations $\phi_\alpha : M_\alpha \hookrightarrow B(K_\alpha)$, then we put $H_\alpha = \bigoplus_{\beta \leq \alpha} K_\beta$ and $H = \varinjlim_\alpha H_\alpha$. Then there is an obvious algebraic monomorphism $\phi : M \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}(H)$. One can show that the mappings $\pi_\alpha \phi$ are continuous, where $\pi_\alpha : \mathcal{L}(H) \rightarrow B(H_\alpha)$ are the canonical epimorphisms. Also $\phi(M) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H)$ is

σ -weakly closed [Frg]. This result in particular implies that the *center*

$$Z(M, \sigma) = \varprojlim_{\alpha} Z(cl_{\sigma_{\alpha}}(\pi_{\alpha}(M)))$$

is also a pro- W^* -algebra .

There is an analogue of the weak operator topology on $\mathcal{L}(H)$, which we denote with $\omega = \varprojlim_{\alpha} \omega_{\alpha}$, where $\omega_{\alpha} = \sigma(\mathcal{B}(H_{\alpha}), \mathcal{F}(H_{\alpha}))$. As $\omega_{\alpha} \leq \sigma_{\alpha}$, for each α , we have $\omega \leq \sigma$. In particular, each ω -closed $*$ -subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}(H)$ is a pro- W^* -algebra . Indeed one can define the analogues of the *compact* and *finite rank* operators on a locally Hilbert space in such a way that

$$\sigma = \sigma(\mathcal{L}(H), \mathcal{K}(H)) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega = \sigma(\mathcal{L}(H), \mathcal{F}(H)).$$

Next we mention some elementary lemmas which are used in the next section. The proofs are easy and are omitted. Following our terminology, we use the name *pro-Banach space* for the projective limits of Banach spaces. These results hold in an algebraic context for vector spaces and pro-vector spaces.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $E = \varinjlim_{\alpha} (E_{\alpha}, \iota_{\alpha\beta})$ be an inductive limit of Banach spaces with the inductive topology $\tau = \varinjlim_{\alpha} \|\cdot\|_{\alpha}$. Then the dual spaces form an inverse system and*

$$\varprojlim_{\alpha} E_{\alpha}^* \simeq (\varinjlim_{\alpha} E_{\alpha})^*,$$

as vector spaces. We denote the pro-Banach space of the right hand side with E^ and call it the dual of E . The weak*-topology induced from the right hand side on E^* is denoted by τ^* . $\square$*

Lemma 2.2. *Let $(E_{\alpha}, \pi_{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda}$ be an inverse system of Banach spaces and $E = \varprojlim_{\alpha} E_{\alpha}$, $\pi_{\alpha} : E \rightarrow E_{\alpha}$ be the corresponding pro-Banach space and morphisms. Let F_{α} be a closed subspace of E_{α} such that $\pi_{\alpha\beta}(F_{\alpha}) \subseteq F_{\beta}$, for each α and β . Then $F = \{x \in E : \pi_{\alpha}(x) \in F_{\alpha} \ (\alpha \in \Lambda)\}$ is a pro-Banach space and $F = \varprojlim_{\alpha} F_{\alpha}$ with morphisms being the restriction of the $\pi_{\alpha\beta}$'s. $\square$*

Lemma 2.3. *Consider the inductive limits of Banach spaces $E = \varinjlim_{\alpha} (E_{\alpha}, e_{\alpha\beta}, e_{\alpha})$, $F = \varinjlim_{\alpha} (F_{\alpha}, f_{\alpha\beta}, f_{\alpha})$, $G = \varinjlim_{\alpha} (G_{\alpha}, g_{\alpha\beta}, g_{\alpha})$, and $H = \varinjlim_{\alpha} (H_{\alpha}, h_{\alpha\beta}, h_{\alpha})$, indexed with the same directed set. Then:*

1. *If $\phi_{\alpha} : E_{\alpha} \rightarrow F_{\alpha}$ satisfies $f_{\alpha\beta}\phi_{\alpha} = \phi_{\beta}e_{\alpha\beta}$ for each α and β , then we can define a map $\phi = \varinjlim_{\alpha} \phi_{\alpha} : E \rightarrow F$ by $f_{\alpha}\phi = \phi_{\alpha}e_{\alpha}$.*
2. *If $\psi = \varinjlim_{\alpha} \psi_{\alpha} : F \rightarrow G$ is defined similarly, then $\psi \circ \phi = \varinjlim_{\alpha} \psi_{\alpha} \circ \phi_{\alpha}$ is also well defined.*
3. *If $F \subseteq E$ and $G \subseteq H$ as in previous lemma, and $\phi = \varinjlim_{\alpha} \phi_{\alpha} : E \rightarrow H$ be as above, then $\phi(F) \subseteq G$ iff $\phi_{\alpha}(F_{\alpha}) \subseteq G_{\alpha}$ for each α . $\square$*

Definition 2.1. *Given a net I , a subnet $J \subseteq I$ is called a cofinal subnet if for each $x \in I$, there is $y \in J$ with $x \leq y$.*

Lemma 2.4. *Let $(E_{\alpha}, \pi_{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha, \beta \in I}$ be an inverse system of Banach spaces (algebras) and $J \subseteq I$ be a subnet of I . Then $(E_{\alpha}, \pi_{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha, \beta \in J}$ is also an inverse system. Let $E_I = \varprojlim_{\alpha \in I} E_{\alpha}$, and $E_J = \varprojlim_{\alpha \in J} E_{\alpha}$ be the corresponding pro-Banach spaces (algebras), and consider the well defined morphism $\pi_{IJ} : E_I \rightarrow E_J$ defined by $(x_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in I} \mapsto (x_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in J}$. Then π_{IJ} is injective iff J is a cofinal subnet of I . If this is the case, E_I and E_J are isomorphic (through π_{IJ}) as topological vector spaces (algebras).*

To have a coherent notation, we denote each element $x \in E = \varprojlim_{\alpha} (E_{\alpha}, e_{\alpha\beta}, e_{\alpha})$ with $x = \varprojlim_{\alpha} x_{\alpha}$, where $x_{\alpha} = e_{\alpha}(x)$ for each α . We use this notation extensively in the next section.

Now let $M = \varprojlim_{\alpha} M_{\alpha}$ be a pro- W^* -algebra for which the morphisms $\pi_{\alpha\beta} : M_{\beta} \rightarrow M_{\alpha}$ are normal. We want to introduce the concept of *predual* for M . For $\alpha \leq \beta$, the epimorphism $\pi_{\alpha\beta} : M_{\beta} \rightarrow M_{\alpha}$ induces a monomorphism $\pi_{\alpha\beta*} : M_{\alpha*} \rightarrow M_{\beta*}$. Clearly $(M_{\alpha*}, \pi_{\alpha\beta*})$ is an inductive system. Let $M_* = \varinjlim_{\alpha} M_{\alpha*}$. We denote the corresponding inductive (projective, respectively) topology of M_* (M , respectively) by τ_* (τ , respectively). Then, by Lemma 2.1, we have:

Proposition 2.1. $(\tilde{M}_*, \tau_*)^* = (\tilde{M}, \tau)$. $\square$

To introduce the concept of the *commutant* for M , we use the above mentioned representation theorem to restrict ourself, without loss of generality, to the case that $M = \varprojlim_{\alpha} (M_{\alpha}, \pi_{\alpha\beta})$ is a sub-pro- W^* -algebra of $\mathcal{L}(H) = \varprojlim_{\alpha} (B(H_{\alpha}), \tilde{\pi}_{\alpha\beta})$ for some locally Hilbert space $H = \varinjlim_{\alpha} H_{\alpha}$, where $M_{\alpha} \subseteq B(H_{\alpha})$ and the normal morphism $\pi_{\alpha\beta}$ is the restriction of $\tilde{\pi}_{\alpha\beta}$ to M_{α} , for each α and β . Then we put

$$M' = \{T \in \mathcal{L}(H) : Tx = xT \ (x \in M)\}.$$

Proposition 2.2. M' is a pro- W^* -algebra. Moreover, if the mappings $\pi_{\alpha\beta}$ are surjective, then $M' \simeq \varprojlim_{\alpha} M'_{\alpha}$ as pro- W^* -algebras.

Proof M' is obviously a σ -closed $*$ -subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}(H)$, so it is a pro- W^* -algebra. Next assume that $\pi_{\alpha\beta}$'s are surjective. Then $\tilde{\pi}_{\alpha\beta}(M'_{\beta}) \subseteq M'_{\alpha}$ (for each $x \in M_{\beta}$ and $y \in M'_{\beta}$, we have $\tilde{\pi}_{\alpha\beta}(y)\pi_{\alpha\beta}(x) = \tilde{\pi}_{\alpha\beta}(yx) = \tilde{\pi}_{\alpha\beta}(xy) = \pi_{\alpha\beta}(x)\tilde{\pi}_{\alpha\beta}(y)$, and each element of M_{α} is of the form $\pi_{\alpha\beta}(x)$ for some $x \in M_{\beta}$, so $\tilde{\pi}_{\alpha\beta}(y) \in M'_{\alpha}$). Let $\pi'_{\alpha\beta}$ to be the restriction of $\tilde{\pi}_{\alpha\beta}$ to M'_{α} , then $(M'_{\alpha}, \pi'_{\alpha\beta})$ is an inverse system and we can form the inverse limit as a sub-pro- W^* -algebra $\mathcal{L}(H)$. But $\tilde{\pi}_{\alpha}(M') \subseteq \{T_{\alpha} \in B(H_{\alpha}) : T_{\alpha}x_{\alpha} = x_{\alpha}T_{\alpha} \ (x_{\alpha} \in M_{\alpha})\}$, which is clearly contained in M'_{α} . Hence $M' \subseteq \{T \in \mathcal{L}(H) : \tilde{\pi}_{\alpha}(T) \in M'_{\alpha} \text{ for each } \alpha\}$. Conversely, if T belongs to the RHS, then given $x \in M$, $\tilde{\pi}_{\alpha}(Tx - xT) = 0$, for each α , and so $Tx - xT = 0$, which means that $T \in M'$. Now by Lemma 2.3, we get $M' \simeq \varprojlim_{\alpha} M'_{\alpha}$ as sub-pro- W^* -algebras of $\mathcal{L}(H)$. $\square$

It is natural to ask if a generalization of *von Neumann double commutant theorem* holds for pro- W^* -algebras. The answer is affirmative.

Theorem 2.1. (Generalized double commutant theorem) Assume that $M = \varprojlim_{\alpha} (M_{\alpha}, \pi_{\alpha\beta})$ is a pro- W^* -algebra such that the morphisms $\pi_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\pi'_{\alpha\beta}$ are surjective, for each α and β . Then M'' is a pro- W^* -algebra and $M \simeq M''$ as pro- W^* -algebras.

Proof By applying the above proposition twice, we have $M' \simeq \varprojlim_{\alpha} M'_{\alpha}$ and $M'' \simeq \varprojlim_{\alpha} M''_{\alpha} = \varprojlim_{\alpha} M_{\alpha} = M$. $\square$

3. NON COMMUTATIVE TOPOLOGY

It is the basic philosophy of the non commutative topology to think of *projections* as analogues of *sets*. Therefore one need to use W^* -algebras, where it is guaranteed that we have plenty of projections. Along this line of thinking, one would consider the *minimal projections* as *points*. To have enough points, then one restricts to

the case of an *atomic W^* -algebra* in which every projection majorizes a minimal one. Yet, not to loose connection with *topological structure*, we have to have this W^* -algebra coming from a C^* -algebra. There are two (basically equivalent) way of performing this task. We start with a C^* -algebra A_0 and consider the *atomic representation* $\{\pi_\alpha, H_\alpha\}$ of it, namely the direct sum of a maximal family $\{\pi_\alpha, H_\alpha\}$ of mutually non equivalent irreducible representations of A_0 (not unique, but spatially equivalent with any other choice), and put $A_a = \pi_a(A_0)'' \subseteq B(H_a)$. This is an atomic W^* -algebra and (a copy of) A_0 is strongly dense in it [Dix]. A more accessible approach, which we adopt in this section, is to consider the union z of all minimal projections in A_0^{**} , then z is a central projection and $A_a = zA_0^{**}$ is an atomic W^* -algebra which contains a strongly dense copy of A_0 , namely zA_0 [Ak69]. If X is a locally compact topological space and $A_0 = C_0(X)$, then $A_a = B(X)$ is the algebra of all bounded functions on X (if μ is a Borel measure on X , then $L^\infty(X)$ is the quotient of $B(X)$ obtained by identifying functions which are equal μ -a.e.).

The non commutative topology is then a certain subset of the lattice $Prj(A_a)$ of projections of A_a . Before going into this, let's introduce some notations due to G. Pedersen. For $E \subseteq A_a$, let E^m be the set of *suprema* in $(A_a)_{sa}$ (self adjoint part of A_a) of all norm bounded increasing nets of elements of E_{sa} . Also let $E_m = -(-E)^m$. We say that E is *lower monotone closed* if $E^m = E$. Now

$$\tau = Prj_{op}(A_a) = Prj(A_a) \cap (A_0^+)^m$$

is called the *Akemann-Giles-Kummer topology* and its elements are called *open* projections. The complements of open projections are called *closed* and their collection is denoted by $Prj_{cl}(A_a)$. For each projection p , its *closer* (*interior*) is defined to be the infimum (supremum) of all closed (open) projections majorizing (majorized by) p , which is a closed (an open) projection and is denoted by $\bar{p}$ (p°). Also the *central cover* (*support*) of p is denoted by $z(p)$ and is defined to be the infimum of all central projections majorizing p . We say that a projection $p \in Prj(A_a)$ is (*relatively*) *compact* if it is closed and $pa = p$ (or equivalently $p \leq a$) for some $a \in A_0^+$ (if $\bar{p}$ is compact, resp.), and denote their collection by $Prj_{cp}(A_a)$ ($Prj_{rc}(A_a)$, resp.). $p \in Prj(A_a)$ is called *regular* if $\|pe\| = \|\bar{p}e\|$, for each $e \in Prj_{op}(A_a)$, and *quasi-compact*, if for each net $(b_\alpha) \subseteq U(\tau)^+$ (see next paragraph for a definition!) with $b = \wedge b_\alpha \in U(\tau)^+$, $\inf_\alpha \|pb_\alpha p\| = \|pbp\|$. We use the notations $Prj_{rg}(A_a)$ and $Prj_{qc}(A_a)$ to denote the collection of these projections. Also we denote the collection of all central and minimal projections by $Prj_{cn}(A_a)$ and $Prj_{mi}(A_a)$, respectively. The last set should be understood as *points* of our space.

One should note that compact projections may not have the *finite covering property*, namely if p is a compact projection and $p \leq \bigvee p_i$, where p_i 's are open projections, one may not be able to *cover* p with a finite subfamily of p_i 's. A contraexample could simply be constructed when p and p_i 's are rank one projections on a Hilbert space [Ake]. However, a version of *finite intersection property* holds for compact projections: If p is compact and p_i 's are closed projections such that any finite intersection of projections $p \wedge p_i$ is non zero, then $p \wedge (\bigwedge p_i) \neq 0$.

Notation 3.1. *Most of the time we need to specify that a projection belongs to two or three classes. We suggest the following abbreviations to avoid lengthy indices. To show a single class of operators we use two letters from the corresponding class's name, so as before: cn , op , cl , cp , rc , qc , and rg stand for central, open, closed, compact, regular, quasi-compact, and regular quasi-compact, respectively.*

closed, compact, relatively compact, quasi compact, and regular, respectively. Now we use also: gq , ro , co , cm , and cro to indicate the class of projections which are "regular and quasi compact", "relatively compact and open", "central and open", "central and minimal", and "central, relatively compact, and open", respectively. For instance, $Prj_{ro}(M) = Prj_{rc}(M) \cap Prj_{op}(M)$.

With this notation we have $Prj_{gq}(A_a) = Prj_{cp}(A_a)$ [Sha, 5.3], and $Prj_{cp}(A_a) \subseteq Prj_{cl}(A_a)$ [Sha, 5.2].

A self adjoint element $a \in A_a$ is called *continuous* (with respect to τ) if the *spectral projections* $E_a(U)$ of a corresponding to open sets $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ are open projections. It is said to *vanish at infinity* if, moreover, $E_a(K)$ is a compact projection for each compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. The set of all elements of A_a whose real and imaginary parts are continuous (and vanishing at infinity) is denoted by $C_b(\tau)$ ($C_0(\tau)$, respectively). Let $\Lambda^+(\tau)$ be the minimal convex cone containing τ and $\Lambda(\tau) = \Lambda^+(\tau) + \mathbb{R}1$. Then the minimal lower monotone closed subset of $(A_a)_{sa}$ containing $\Lambda(\tau)$ is denoted by $L(\tau)$ and its elements are the *lower semi continuous* (self adjoint) elements of A_a . The *upper semi continuous* (self adjoint) elements of A_a are defined similarly and denoted by $U(\tau)$. An element of A_a whose real and imaginary parts are both lower and upper semi continuous is called *quasi continuous* and $Q(\tau)$ denotes their collection. Then we have the following equalities:

$$A_0 = C_0(\tau), \quad A_b = M(A_0) = A_0^m \cap A_{0,m} = C_b(\tau), \quad QM(A_0) = \overline{\tilde{A}_0^m} \cap \overline{\tilde{A}_{0,m}} = Q(\tau),$$

where $QM(A_0)$ is the space of quasi multipliers of A_0 [AR].

The Akemann-Giles-Kummer (quasi) topology τ on the atomic W^* -algebra $M = A_a$ satisfies a number of axioms (it is so called a C^* -topology):

1. $0, 1 \in \tau$,
2. For each $(p_\alpha) \subseteq \tau \quad \forall p_\alpha \in \tau$,
3. If $p, q \in \tau$ and $pq = qp$ then $p \wedge q \in \tau$,
4. $\tau = L(\tau) \cap Pr(M)$,
5. For each $a \in \Lambda^+(\tau)$, $a^{\frac{1}{2}} \in L(\tau)$,
6. For each unitary $u \in C_b(\tau)$, $u^* \tau u \subseteq \tau$.

Moreover it has the following properties:

7. T_1 : $\forall e, f \in Prj_{mi}(A_a) \exists p \in Prj_{op}(A_a) \quad ef = 0 \vdash e \leq p \text{ and } pf = 0$,
8. *Hausdorff*: $\forall e, f \in Prj_{mi}(A_a) \exists p, q \in Prj_{op}(A_a) \quad ef = 0 \vdash e \leq p \text{ and } f \leq q$,
9. *locally compact*: $\forall e \in Prj_{mi}(A_a) \exists p \in Prj_{ro}(A_a) \quad e \leq p$,
10. *regular*: $\forall e \in Prj_{mi}(A_a) \forall f \in Prj_{cl}(A_a) \exists p, q \in Prj_{op}(A_a) \quad ef = 0 \vdash pq = 0, p \geq e, \text{ and } q \geq f$,
11. *completely regular*: $\forall e \in Prj_{mi}(A_a) \forall f \in Prj_{cl}(A_a) \exists a \in C_0(\tau)_1^+ \quad ef = 0 \vdash ae = e \text{ and } af = 0$,

One can show that a C^* -topology (on any atomic W^* -algebra) is the Akemann-Giles-Kummer topology of a C^* -algebra iff it is T_1 , completely regular, and locally compact [Sha, 5.5]. We say that τ is *compact* if $1 \in Prj_{cp}(A_a)$. This holds iff $A_0 = A_b = M(A_0)$ (that's when A_0 is unital) [Sha, 5.6].

Although A_a provides an ideal setting for *topological* observations, it is still quite *large* for measure theoretic purposes (if $A_0 = C_0(X)$ then the functions in $A_a = B(X)$ are not necessarily measurable). On the other hand, any successful theory of locally compact (quantum) groups should appreciate the close relation between *topology* and *measure theory*. This could be demonstrated by the fact

that for a Hausdorff topological group (of second category) the existence of the Haar measure and locally compactness are indeed equivalent [Ng].

Fortunately there is a well established theory to be used for this purpose, namely the *measurable* decomposition theory [Pd79, ch4]. We quote here some of the basics of this theory. Recall that if $\{\pi_a, H_a\} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \hat{A}_0} \{\pi_\alpha, H_\alpha\}$ be the atomic representation of a C^* -algebra A_0 , then $A_a = \pi_a(A_0)'' \subseteq B(H_a)$ is a atomic W^* -algebra. Indeed $A_a = \sum_{\alpha}^{\oplus} B(H_\alpha)$. Now π_a has a unique extension to a normal representation $\bar{\pi}_a$ of A_0^{**} , such that $\bar{\pi}_a(A_0^{**}) = \sum_{\alpha}^{\oplus} B(H_\alpha)$. Hence, π_a being faithful, this shows that $\bar{\pi}_a$ is not faithful in general. However, one can single out a large class inside A^{**} on which $\bar{\pi}_a$ is faithful (isometric). An element $x \in A_{sa}^{**}$ is called *universally measurable* if for each $\epsilon > 0$ and each $\omega \in S(A_0)$, there are $a, b \in ((A_0)_{sa})^m$ such that $-b \leq x \leq a$ and $\omega(a+b) < \epsilon$. The family of all such elements is denoted by $\mathcal{U}(A_0)$. This is a norm closed real vector space containing $((\hat{A}_{sa})^m)^-$. Thus $A_{mu} = \mathcal{U}(A_0) + i\mathcal{U}(A_0)$ is a C^* -subalgebra of A_0^{**} . Also elements of $\mathcal{U}(A_0)$ could be approximated strongly from above (below) by elements of $((A_0)_{sa})^m$ (respectively $((A_0)_{sa})_m$).

Usually it is more useful if one restricts to the class of the universally measurable ones. For this reason, we consider the real vector space $\mathcal{B}((A_0)_{sa})$ which is defined as the smallest class (in A_0^{**}) which contains both $(A_0)_{sa}$ and the strong limits of all monotone (increasing or decreasing) sequences of elements of $(A_0)_{sa}$. Then this is the self adjoint part of a C^* -algebra. The C^* -algebra $A_{bm} = \mathcal{B}((A_0)_{sa}) + i\mathcal{B}((A_0)_{sa})$ is called the *enveloping Borel $*$ -algebra* of A_0 (first introduced by Richard Kadison). If A_0 is separable, then A_{bm} is unital (this might fail in non separable case). In this case, A_{bm} is closed under bounded Borel functional calculus, central support (cover), and polar decomposition. Also each representation $\{\pi_0, H_0\}$ of A_0 uniquely extends to a sequentially normal representation π_{bm} of A_{bm} , and $\pi_{bm}(A_{bm}) = (\pi_0(A_0))_{bm}$ in $B(H_0)$. In particular, when A_0 and $\{\pi_0, H_0\}$ are separable, then $\pi_0''(A_{bm}) = \pi_0(A_0)''$ (in the universal Hilbert space), and center is mapped onto the center.

We know that the atomic representation is faithful on A_{um} . On the other hand A_{um} is monotone sequentially closed, so in particular $A_{bm} \subseteq A_{um}$ and π_a is also faithful on A_{bm} . Therefore, after appropriate identifications, we have

$$A_0 \subseteq A_{bm} \subseteq A_{um} \subseteq A_a \subseteq A_u.$$

In the commutative case, when $A_0 = C_0(X)$, A_{bm} and A_{um} are the algebras of all bounded Borel and universally measurable functions on X , respectively, where as $A_a = A_u = B(X)$, the set of all bounded functions on X .

There are also the strong and weak version (in contrast with the norm version) of the enveloping Borel $*$ -algebra. Consider A_0 in its universal representation. Then one can define the C^* -algebras A_{bm}^s and A_{bm}^w similar to A_{bm} by just replacing the norm sequential monotone limits with strong and weak one (the later is what is called a Σ^* -algebra by E.B. Davis [Dav]). Then we have

$$A_{bm} \subseteq A_{bm}^s \subseteq A_{bm}^w.$$

It seems that these three C^* -algebras should be indeed equal (like in the commutative case), but I am not aware of any general result in this direction (we know an affirmative answer for the case of type I C^* -algebras). Now A_{um} is indeed strongly sequentially closed. Therefore we can toss in these algebras in the above sequence

of inclusions as

$$A_0 \subseteq A_{bm} \subseteq A_{bm}^s \subseteq A_{um} \cap A_{bm}^w \subseteq A_{um} \cup A_{bm}^w \subseteq A_a \subseteq A_u.$$

As for the relation of these algebras with the non commutative topology, first observe that all open and closed projections of A_a are limits of monotone nets of (positive) elements of A_0 . Therefore if we restrict ourselves to the separable case, we get $\tau = \text{Prj}_{op}(A_a) \subseteq A_{bm}$. Also all closed (and so compact) projections of A_a already belong to A_{bm} . Therefore one can simply apply most of the *topological* results proven for A_a to A_{bm} also. We make this more precise in the forthcoming sections. Here we rather want to emphasize on the importance of A_{bm} in non commutative measure theory. This is crucial if one wants to deal with unbounded measures. For instance for a locally compact group G one can extend the Haar measure to a weight on $B^\infty(G)$, but it is not possible (or at least clear how) to do this for $B(G)$.

First let us note that A_{bm} is inside the atomic W^* -algebra A_a , so one can hope to have minimal projections inside A_{bm} . Indeed there are plenty of them. Let A_0 be a separable C^* -algebra in its atomic representation and $P(A_0)$ be the set of its pure states (the ones which correspond to irreducible representations). Let $\hat{A}_0$ be the *spectrum* of A_0 , that's the set of equivalence classes of irreducible representations of A_0 . Then there is a one-one correspondence between $P(A_0)$ ($\hat{A}_0$, respectively) and $\text{Prj}_{mi}(A_{bm})$ ($\text{Prj}_{cm}(A_{bm})$, respectively) [Pd71]. In this correspondence a state $\omega \in P(A_0)$ is sent to the one dimensional projection p onto the subspace of H_a spanned by the unit vector in H_a which represents ω in its *GNS*-representation. Conversely given $p \in \text{Prj}_{mi}(A_{bm})$, the reduced algebra $(A_{bm})_p$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}$ and ω is just defined on A_{bm} by $\omega(x) = p x p$, which turn out to be a σ -normal pure state of A_{bm} , and thereby a pure state of A_0 . Also the center of A_{bm} is indeed equal to $B_\sigma^\infty(\hat{A}_0)$, where index σ tells us that we have to restrict to a sub σ -field of Borel measurable sets (namely the *Davis-Borel structure* on $\hat{A}_0$), and the second correspondence could be rephrased as the assertion that the points of $\hat{A}_0$ are Davis-Borel sets.

Every state of A_0 extends uniquely to a σ -additive functional on A_{bm} . One can not hope to get a normal state extension on A_{bm} (neither on A_a) in general. For this reason, G.K. Pedersen has singled out a class of states (which he calls *atomic* states) for which this is possible [Pd71]. Here we briefly quote this theory. Let's recall that A_{bm} could be embedded in the direct sum of $B(H_i)$, the bounded operators on the Hilbert space of the representations indexed by, and associated with, elements of $P(A_0)$. Let J be the smallest monotone closed C^* -subalgebra of A_{bm} containing $\text{Prj}_{mi}(A_{bm})$. J could be identified with the ideal consisting of those (x_i) 's in the above direct sum which have countably many nonzero components. A positive functional $\omega \in A_0^*$ is called *atomic* (*diffuse*) if there is (for all) $p \in \text{Prj}_{mi}(A_{bm})$ such that $\omega(1 - p) = 0$ ($\omega(p) = 0$). Each positive functional then uniquely decomposes as the sum of an atomic and a diffuse one (which are centrally orthogonal). The atomic functionals are exactly those which could be decomposed as a countable linear combination of (mutually orthogonal) pure states. These functionals extend uniquely to a normal state on A_{bm} (and A_a).

It is useful to note that the above observations have unbounded analogues. Indeed all of the above statements are also valid for the following situation [Pd71]: Let ω be a σ -normal weight on A_{bm} which is majorized by an invariant (under spatial inner automorphisms) convex functional ρ on A_{bm}^+ such that there is a sequence

(e_n) of ρ -finite elements (projections) in A_{bm} , summing to 1. These conditions hold (with $\rho = \omega$), in particular, when ω is a σ -finite σ -trace [Dav], or a C^* -integral [Pd 69]. Then ω decomposes as the countable sum of ρ -normal bounded linear functionals $\omega_n = \omega(e_n \cdot)$. Moreover, there is a sequence (p_n) of central projections in J such that $\omega_n(p_n \cdot)$ ($\omega_n((1 - p_n) \cdot)$, respectively) is atomic (diffuse, respectively). In particular, ω decomposes as the sum of the atomic and diffuse weights $\omega(p \cdot)$ and $\omega((1 - p) \cdot)$, where $p = \vee p_n \in Z(A_{bm}) \cap J$. As for the decomposition of an atomic weight ω into sum (mutually orthogonal) of pure states, one should note that this is not doable in general (even with above restrictions) unless ω is a trace.

4. THE LOCAL ALGEBRA AND THE QUASI LOCAL SPACE OF A C^* -ALGEBRA

Let M be a W^* -algebra on a Hilbert space H . If a bounded operator commutes with elements of M' , then it should belong to M by double commutant theorem. A closed operator, however, could commute with elements of M' but does not belong to M . In this situation we say that it is *affiliated* with M . The set of all closed (densely defined) operators on H affiliated with M is denoted by M^n . There are many situations that we need to consider affiliated elements. In this section we consider a class of such elements coming from pro- W^* -algebras.

The basic idea is to use *cut down* by projections as a non commutative analog of *neighborhoods*. In particular, working with unbounded elements, we are mainly interested in compact neighborhoods. There is a notion of compactness of projections defined by Akemann [Ak69]. This was originally manufactured to get a Stone-Weierstrass theorem for C^* -algebras, but it also suits our purposes. We briefly discussed this in previous section. Let's recall the basic terminology. Let A_0 be a C^* -algebra and $A_a = zA_0^{**}$, where $z \in \text{Prj}_{cn}(A_0^{**})$ is the supremum of all minimal projections. In particular A_a is an atomic W^* -algebra. For any closed left ideal $I \subseteq A_0$ the weak closure of I is a weakly closed left ideal of M (after identifying A_0 with zA_0), and so is of the form $A_0 p$, for some $p \in \text{Prj}(A_a)$. The projections obtained in this way are called *open* and we denote the set of all open projections by $\text{Prj}_{op}(A_a)$. The complement of these type of projections are called *closed* and are collected in $\text{Prj}_{cl}(A_a)$. Given $p \in \text{Prj}(A_a)$, the smallest closed projection $\geq p$ is called the *closure* of p and is denoted by $\bar{p}$. A projection $p \in \text{Prj}(A_a)$ is open (closed) iff there is an increasing (decreasing) net of positive elements in A converging to p in *weak**-topology. A closed projection $p \in M$ is called *compact* if there is $a \in A_0^+$ with $ap = p$. A projection p is called *relatively compact* if $\bar{p}$ is compact. We denote the set of all (relatively) compact projections by $\text{Prj}_{cp}(A_a)$ ($\text{Prj}_{rc}(A_a)$, respectively). Given a closed left ideal I of A_0 , the corresponding open projection is relatively compact iff $I \subseteq A_{00} = K(A_0)$. A closed projection is compact iff it is closed projection in $\tilde{A}_0^{**}$, where $\tilde{A}_0$ is the minimal unitization of A_0 [Ak69]. In particular all closed projections of A_0^{**} are compact iff A_0 is unital.

Lemma 4.1. *With above notations, TFAE*

1. $1 \in \text{Prj}_{cp}(A_a)$,
2. $\text{Prj}_{cp}(A_a) = \text{Prj}_{cl}(A_a)$,
3. $1 \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)$,
4. $\text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a) = \text{Prj}_{op}(A_a)$,
5. A_0 is unital,
6. $A_0 = A_0^n$,
7. $A_{00} = A_0 = A = A_b = A_q$.

Moreover, (any of) these conditions would imply that

$$(8) \quad H_{q\ell} = H_\ell = H_a, \mathcal{L}(H_{q\ell}) = \mathcal{L}(H_\ell) = B(H_a), \text{ and } A_{q\ell} = A_\ell = A_a.$$

Proof The equivalence of (1) and (2) is obvious. Since 1 is both open and closed, (1) is equivalent to (3) and (4) implies (1). Also (2) obviously implies (4). The equivalence of (5) and (1) is [Sha, 5.6]. Also the equivalence of (5), (6), and (7) is obvious. Finally (1) implies (8), because 1 being a (central) open relatively compact projection, we get $H_{q\ell} = H_a$ and all the locally bounded operators become bounded. $\square$

For each $p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)$, $A_p^a = (A_a)_p = pA_ap$ is a W^* -algebra and we have an (involutive) linear map $\pi_p^a : A_a \rightarrow A_p^a$, $x \mapsto pxp$. Consider the canonical order on $\text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)$, that's $p \leq q$ iff $pq = qp = p$. In particular, for $p \leq q$, the linear map $\pi_{pq}^a : A_q^a \rightarrow A_p^a$; $qxq \mapsto pxp$ is well defined and

$$\pi_{pq}^a \pi_{qr}^a = \pi_{pr}^a, \quad \pi_{pq}^a \pi_q^a = \pi_p^a \quad (p \leq q \leq r).$$

Hence we have an inverse system (A_p^a, π_{pq}^a) of C^* -algebras. Now let $A_{q\ell} = \varprojlim_{p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)} A_p^a$ be the corresponding pro- C^* -algebra and denote the corresponding morphisms from $A_{q\ell}$ to A_p^a by π_p^ℓ , then $\pi_{pq}^a \pi_q^\ell = \pi_p^\ell$, for each $p, q \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)$. $A_{q\ell}$ is called the *quasi local space* of A_0 . Note that this is merely a (locally convex) topological vector space and not an algebra. Although A_p^a 's are all W^* -algebras, but π_{pq}^a 's are hardly ever homomorphisms. Indeed even in the trivial case where $A_0 = M_2(\mathbb{C})$, $q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $p = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, the map $\pi_{pq}^a : x \mapsto pxp$ is not a homomorphism (simply there is no nonzero algebra homomorphism from $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ to $pM_2(\mathbb{C})p$).

Recall that A_a could be considered as $A_a = \pi_a(A_0)'' \subseteq B(H_a)$, where $\{\pi_a, H_a\}$ is the *atomic representation* of A_0 . Now, for each $p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)$, consider the closed subspace $H_p^a = pH_a$ of H_a . If $p, q \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)$ and $p \leq q$, then $H_p^a = pH_a = qpH_a \subseteq qH_a = H_q^a$. Also the inner product of H_q^a restricted to H_p^a clearly coincides with that of H_p^a . Hence, if $\iota_{pq}^a : H_p^a \rightarrow H_q^a$ be the corresponding embedding, we get the local Hilbert space $H_{q\ell} = \varprojlim_{p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)} (H_p^a, \iota_{pq}^a)$ [Ino]. Again note that we are taking the *algebraic* direct limit, so in this case, $H_{q\ell}$ is indeed the union of subspaces pH_a of H_a , where p runs over all open relatively compact projections in A_a . In particular $H_{q\ell} \subseteq H_a$. The case where this is indeed dense is more interesting as we see in a moment. But first let's observe that $A_{q\ell}$ is a subspace of

$$\mathcal{L}(H_{q\ell}) = \varprojlim_{p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)} B(H_p).$$

Proposition 4.1. *With above notations,*

1. For each $p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)$, $B(H_p^a) = pB(H_a)p$.
2. The linear maps $\pi_{pq}^a : A_q^a \rightarrow A_p^a$ are the restrictions of the maps $\bar{\pi}_{pq}^a : B(H_q^a) \rightarrow B(H_p^a)$ and $A_{q\ell}$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{L}(H_{q\ell})$.
3. The mapping $x \mapsto (pxp)_{p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)}$ is an embedding of A_a into $A_{q\ell}$.

Proof Recall that $H_p^a = pH_a$. Now for each $T \in B(H_a)$ and $\zeta \in H_a$, we have $pTp(p\zeta) = pTp(\zeta) = p(Tp\zeta)$, so $pTp \in L(H_p^a)$. Also clearly $\|pTp\|_{H_p^a} \leq \|p\|^2 \|T\| \leq \infty$, hence $pTp \in B(H_p^a)$. Conversely, consider the orthogonal decomposition $H_a = pH_a \oplus (1-p)H_a$. Then $pH_a = \{p\eta : \eta \in pH_a\}$. (The advantage of choosing η in pH_a - and not in H_a - is that each element of pH_a can be written *uniquely* in the form $p\eta$, where $\eta \in pH_a$). Now let $S \in B(H_p^a)$ and $\zeta \in H_a$. Let η be the unique element

of pH_a with $S(p\zeta) = p\eta$. Then the map T which sends ζ to η is a well-defined linear map on H and $pTp(p\zeta) = pT(p\zeta) = p(p\eta) = p\eta = S(p\zeta)$, for each $\zeta \in H_a$, i.e. $S = pTp$. To show that T is bounded, observe that $T(\zeta) = \eta = p\eta = Sp(\zeta)$, so $\|T\| \leq \|S\|_{H_p^a} \|p\| \leq \infty$. Hence $T \in B(H_a)$ and (1) is proved. Now (2) follows immediately and (3) is trivial. $\square$

Now assume for a moment that $\cup_p pH_a$ is norm dense in H_a . Consider $\bar{x} \in A_a$, and let x be the restriction of $\bar{x}$ to $H_a \subseteq H_{q\ell}$. Put

$$D(x) = \{\zeta \in H_a : x\zeta \in H_a\},$$

then, for each $p \in Prj_{ro}(A_a)$ and $\zeta \in H_a$, we have $pxp\zeta \in pH_a \subseteq H_a$, that's $pH_a \subseteq D(x)$. In particular it follows from the above lemma that $D(x) \subseteq H_a$ is norm dense. Therefore $\tilde{x} : D(x) \subseteq H_a \rightarrow H_a$ is a densely defined (unbounded) operator on H_a . Also note that $p\tilde{x}p\zeta = pxp\zeta$, therefore $\tilde{x}$ is uniquely determined by x . Also $pxp = p\tilde{x}p \in A_p^a \subseteq A_a$ for each $p \in Prj_{ro}(A_a)$.

We claim that $\tilde{x} \in A_a^\eta$. Indeed, for each $p \in Prj_{ro}(A_a)$ and $y \in A_a'$, we have $p(xy - yx)p = y(pxp) - (pxp)y = 0$, so $xy - yx = 0$ in $\mathcal{L}(H_{q\ell})$, and we are done. Now identifying $\tilde{x}$ with x we have

Proposition 4.2. *If $H_{q\ell}$ is norm-dense in H_a , then $A_{q\ell} \subseteq A_a^\eta$.* $\square$

Up to now we have worked with a variety of projections. It is the time to see what happens if, in each case, we restrict ourself to the ones which are also *central*. The fact that each projection in a W^* -algebra has a *central cover*, and if the projection is compact then so is its central cover, also motivates us to consider this situation. In particular we are interested in the family Prj_{cro} of all central, relatively compact open projections of A_a .

Now consider the sub-system $(A_p^a, \pi_p q^a)_{p,q \in Prj_{cro}(A_a)}$ and form the corresponding pro- W^* -algebra $A_\ell = \varprojlim_{p \in Prj_{cro}(A_a)} A_p^a$. This is called the *local algebra* of A_0 . We have gathered some of the properties of A_ℓ in the following proposition which could be proved similar to the quasi local case.

Proposition 4.3. *Let A_0 be a C^* -algebra, and $\{\pi_a, H_a\}$ be its atomic representation. Let $A_a = \pi_a(A_0)''$ and A_ℓ be the corresponding atomic W^* -algebra and local algebra of A_0 , then we have*

1. *For each $p \in Prj_{cro}(A_a)$, consider the closed subspace $H_p^a = pH_a$ of H_a . If $p, q \in Prj_{cro}(A_a)$ and $p \leq q$, then $H_p^a = pH_a = qpH_a \subseteq qH_a = H_q^a$. Also the inner product of H_q^a restricted to H_p^a coincides with that of H_p^a . If $\iota_{pq}^a : H_p^a \rightarrow H_q^a$ be the corresponding embedding, then $H_\ell = \varprojlim_{p \in Prj_{cro}(A_a)} (H_p^a, \iota_{pq}^a)$ is a locally Hilbert space and $\mathcal{L}(H_\ell) = \varprojlim_{p \in Prj_{cro}(A_a)} (B(H_p), \bar{\pi}_{pq}^a)$ is a pro- W^* -algebra,*
2. *The morphisms $\pi_{pq}^a : A_q^a \rightarrow A_p^a$ are the restrictions of the morphisms $\bar{\pi}_{pq}^a : B(H_q^a) \rightarrow B(H_p^a)$ and A_ℓ is the sub-pro- W^* -algebra of $\mathcal{L}(H_\ell)$,*
3. *The mapping $x \mapsto (pxp)_{p \in Prj_{cro}(A_a)}$ is an embedding of A_a into A_ℓ ,*
4. $A_{00} \subseteq A_0 \subseteq A_b \subseteq A_a \subseteq A_\ell$. $\square$

A natural question is that when the local and quasi local algebras coincide. Here is one answer.

Proposition 4.4. *Let A_0 be a C^* -algebra and A_a be its atomic W^* -algebra. Then TFAE:*

1. *For each $p \in Prj_{ro}(A_a)$, $z(p) \in Prj_{cro}(A_a)$,*

2. $Prj_{cro}(A_a) \subseteq Prj_{ro}(A_a)$ is cofinal,
3. $A_{q\ell} \simeq A_\ell$ as $pro\text{-}C^*$ -algebras.

Proof (1) and (2) are equivalent by the well known facts that $p \leq z(p)$ and that $p \leq q$ implies $z(p) \leq z(q)$. The equivalence of (2) and (3) follows from Lemma 2.4 . $\square$

In next section we characterize those C^* -algebras which satisfy these equivalent conditions (see Theorem 5.1).

We have used the relatively compact open projections as the "neighborhoods" of our quasi local algebra. Now we want to make sure that we have plenty of these projections in A_a . More precisely, we want to check the following statements about the projections of A_a :

1. Every open projection majorizes a relatively compact open projection ,
2. Every open projection is the sum of finite rank projections,
3. $\bigvee Prj_{ro}(A_a) = 1$.

We start with the following lemma which is an immediate consequence of [Ak70, I.3].

Lemma 4.2. $Prj_{rc}(A_a) = \{p \in Prj(A_a) : \exists a \in A^+ \quad ap = p\}$. $\square$

The following result has been communicated to us by Professor Charles Akemann for which we are grateful to him.

Proposition 4.5. *Each $p \in Prj(A_a)$ is the sum of finite rank projections in A_a . In particular, there exists some $q \in Prj_{cp}(A_a)$ such that $q \leq p$.*

Proof [Ake]. $\square$

Corollary 4.1. $\bigvee \{p : p \in Prj_{cp}(A_a)\} = 1$.

Proof Let q be the LHS projection. If $1 - q \neq 0$ then there is a relatively compact projection $p \leq 1 - q$. But $p \leq \bar{p} \leq q$, by construction, so $p \leq q(1 - q) = 0$, a contradiction. $\square$

5. LOCAL ALGEBRAS AND MULTIPLIERS

Let A_0 be a C^* -algebra and $A_{00} = K(A_0)$ be its Pedersen ideal. Let $A_a = zA_0^{**}$ be the atomic W^* -algebra which we associated to A_0 in last section. Also there we showed how to associate $pro\text{-}W^*$ -algebras A_ℓ and $A_{q\ell}$ to the atomic W^* -algebra A_a of A_0 . In the definition of these $pro\text{-}W^*$ -algebras we used the family of open relatively compact (central) projections . In this section we investigate the relation between these type of projections and the Pedersen's ideal of A_0 .

Let's introduce some notations. We denote by $Her(A_0)$, $Idl(A_0)$, and $Idl^\ell(A_0)$, the collection of all hereditary C^* -subalgebras, all closed two sided ideal, and all closed left ideal of A_0 , respectively. We add index cp in each case to indicate that we are restricting to those which are contained in A_{00} , so for instance $Her_{cp}(A_0)$ is the collection of all hereditary C^* -subalgebras of A_0 contained in A_{00} . Also for

each $J \subseteq A_0$ let's put

$$\begin{aligned} \text{span}(J) &= \text{linear span of } J, \\ \text{conv}(J) &= \text{convex hull of } J, \\ \text{her}(J) &= \{a \in A_0^+ : a \leq b, \text{ some } b \in J\}, \\ \text{sym}(J) &= \text{env} \cup_{t \in \mathbb{T}} tJ, \\ \text{idl}_\ell(J) &= \{a \in A_0 : a^*a \in J\}, \\ \text{idl}_r(J) &= \{a \in A_0 : aa^* \in J\}. \end{aligned}$$

We say that J is a *face* if it is hereditary (i.e. $\text{her}(J) = J$) and convex (i.e. $\text{conv}(J) = J$). In this case $L = \text{idl}_\ell(J)$ is a left ideal of A_0 , $(L^*L)^+ = J$, and $L^*L = \text{span}(J)$.

The relation between the lattice $\text{Prj}(A_a)$ and the dense ideal $K(A_0)$ could be seen even by looking at the very definition of $K(A_0)$. Indeed recall that

$$K_0(A_0) = \{a \in A^+ : ab = a, \text{ some } b \in A^+\} \supseteq \{a \in A^+ : [a] \in \text{Prj}_{rc}(A_a)\}$$

and $K(A_0) = \text{span}(\text{her}(\text{conv}(K_0(A))))$ [Pd66, III]. Also to each $p \in \text{Prj}_{op}(A_a)$ one can associate a hereditary C^* -subalgebra of A_0 defined by $\text{her}(p) = pA_ap \cap A_0$. If moreover p is relatively compact, then $\text{her}(p) \subseteq K(A_0)$. Indeed

$$K(A_0) = \text{her}(\cup_{p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)} \text{her}(p)) = \text{sym}(\text{her}(\text{conv}(\cup_{p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)} \text{her}(p)))).$$

Remark: In [Ped66, II] this has been stated for A^{**} but it is easy to see that we have it for zA^{**} also. (cf. [Pd72, 3.8] and [AP, 2.6]).

We denote $\text{idl}(\text{her}(p))$ and $\text{idl}_\ell(\text{her}(p))$ simply by $\text{idl}(p)$ and $\text{idl}_\ell(p)$, respectively. Also for $a \in A_0$, $\text{her}(a)$ and $\text{idl}(a)$ simply denote the hereditary C^* -subalgebra and closed two sided ideal of A_0 generated by a , respectively.

The following lemma is contained in [Ped66, II]. It also could be proved directly as follows.

Lemma 5.1. *If an open projection p of A_a is relatively compact then $\text{her}(p) \subseteq K_0(A_0) \subseteq K(A_0)$.*

Proof By definition, there is $a \in A_0^+$ such that $a\bar{p} = \bar{p}$. But $p \leq \bar{p}$, so $\bar{p}p = p$, hence $ap = p$. Now if $b \in \text{her}(p) = pA_ap \cap A_0$, then $b = pb = apb = ab$, so $b \in K_0(A_0) \subseteq K(A_0)$. $\square$

Unfortunately the converse is not true, as one can see from the following example communicated to us by Professor Gert K. Pedersen, for which we are grateful to him. This example also shows that a (left) ideal could be contained in $K(A_0)$ but yet the open projection which supports it not to be compact.

Example 5.1. *Let A_0 be the universal C^* -algebra generated by two projections p and q . Namely A_0 is the algebra of continuous functions f on $[0, 1]$ taking values in the 2×2 matrices, for which there are $s, t \in \mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$f(0) = \begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad f(1) = \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix}.$$

The two generators correspond to the functions

$$p(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad q(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1-t & (t-t^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ (t-t^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} & t \end{pmatrix}.$$

The point is that A_0 is not unital, but $K(A_0) = A_0$. Thus the unit 1 in $\tilde{A}_0$ is not compact, although it supports a left ideal (viz A_0) inside $K(A_0) = A_0$. Also $\text{her}(1) = A_0 = K(A_0)$. If we consider the left ideal generated by $p + q$ we still get $A_0 = K(A_0)$ so there is no hope for singly generated ideals also. Note that A_0 is a subalgebra of $C([0, 1], \mathbb{M}_2(\mathbb{C})) = C([0, 1]) \otimes \mathbb{M}_2(\mathbb{C})$ which is separable.

Proposition 5.1. *There is a one to one correspondence between the elements of each of the following group of sets:*

1. $\text{Prj}_{op}(A_a), \text{Her}(A_0)$, and $\text{Idl}^\ell(A_0)$,
2. $\text{Prj}_{co}(A_a)$ and $\text{Idl}(A_0)$,

where in both cases the correspondence between the first two sets is through a map of the form $p \mapsto \text{her}(p)$ and in the first case the correspondence between the second and the third set is through a map of the form $H \mapsto \text{idl}^\ell(H)$. Moreover under the above correspondence we have

- (3) $\text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a) \subseteq \text{Idl}_{cp}^\ell(A_0) \subseteq \text{Her}_{cp}(A_0)$,
- (4) $\text{Prj}_{cro}(A_a) \subseteq \text{Idl}_{cp}(A_0)$.

Proof (1) is proved in [Ped66, II,1.1] for A^{**} and follows for $A_a = zA^{**}$ as z is central. To see (2) we only need to observe that $\text{idl}_\ell(p)$ is a two sided ideal iff p is central. Now (4) and the first inclusion of (3) follow from Lemma 5.1. To show the first inclusion of (3), let $\text{her}(p) \subseteq K(A_0)$, then, by [Cm70, 1.3.2], $\text{idl}_\ell(\text{her}(p)) = \text{her}(p).A_0 \subseteq K(A_0).A_0 \subseteq K(A_0)$. $\square$

Unfortunately the inclusions in part (3) and (4) could be strict (see above example). Here we consider a class of $(\sigma$ -unital) C^* -algebras A_0 for which this holds. These C^* -algebras are already studied by Huaxin Lin [Lin]. There he calls them *pseudo commutative*, but we think that *pseudo unital* is a better name.

Definition 5.1. (Lin) *Let A_0 be a C^* -algebra. We say that A_0 is pseudo unital if it has a countable approximate identity (e_n) such that*

$$\forall n \exists N > n \forall a \in A_0 \quad e_n a = e_n a e_N.$$

In particular A_0 would be σ -unital. Examples are $C_0(X)$ and $C_0(X) \otimes A$, where X is a σ -compact Hausdorff topological space, and A is a unital C^* -algebra.

Also, following [Lin] we define a *support algebra* of a σ -unital C^* -algebra A_0 to be a dense subalgebra of the form $\bigcup (p_n A_0^{**} p_n \cap A_0)$, where p_n 's are projections in A_0^{**} with $e_n \leq p_n \leq e_{n+1}$ ($n \geq 1$), for some (countable) approximate identity (e_n) of A_0 .

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.1. *Let A_0 be a σ -unital C^* -algebra. Consider the following statements:*

1. A_0 is pseudo unital,
2. $K(A_0)$ is a (the only) support algebra of A_0 ,
3. $\bigcup_{a \in K(A_0)^+} \text{idl}(a) = K(A_0)$,
4. For each hereditary C^* -subalgebra b of A_0 contained in $K(A_0)$, the closed two sided ideal generated by b is also contained in $K(A_0)$,
5. For each $a \in K(A_0)$, $\text{idl}(a) \subseteq K(A_0)$,
6. For each projection $p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)$, $\text{idl}(p) \subseteq K(A_0)$.
7. For each $p \in \text{Prj}_{cro}(A_a)$, $z(p) \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a)$,
8. $\Gamma(K(A_0)) \neq \Delta(K(A_0)) = M(A_0)$ and the spectrum $\hat{A}_0$ of A_0 is not compact.

Then the following implications hold

$$(4) \implies (5) \implies (3) \iff (2) \iff (1) \implies (8), (5) \iff (6), \text{ and } (7) \implies (6).$$

Proof The fact that $(1) \iff (2) \implies (8)$ is already proved in [Lin]. To show that (2) and (3) are equivalent, first note that the LHS of (3) is a support algebra of A_0 . Indeed if (e_n) is any countable approximate identity of A_0 contained in $K(A_0)$, then there are open central projections p_n in A_0^{**} such that $idl(e_n) = p_n A_0^{**} \cap A_0$. Then $e_n \leq p_n$ and $\bigcup_n idl(e_n)$ is a support algebra of A_0 . This is a dense ideal of A_0 , so it contains $K(A_0)$, in particular each $a \in K(A_0)^+$ is contained in some $idl(e_n)$, which implies that $idl(a) \subseteq idl(e_n)$, and hence $\bigcup_{a \in K(A_0)^+} idl(a) = \bigcup_n idl(e_n)$ is a support algebra of A_0 . Now the equivalence follows from the fact that the two statements involved in (2) are already equivalent [Lin]. Now if (4) holds and $a \in K(A_0)$, then $her(a) \subseteq K(A_0)$ so, by assumption, $idl(a) = idl(her(a)) \subseteq K(A_0)$, which is (5). To see that (5) implies (6), let $p \in Proj_{ro}(A_a)$, then $p \leq a$, for some $a \in K(A_0)^+$, so $idl(p) \subseteq idl(a) \subseteq K(A_0)$.

To finish the proof we show that $(6) \implies (5) \implies (3)$. Assuming (6), let $a \in K(A_0)$, then the range projection $p = [a]$ of a is a compact projection in A_0^{**} , and $a \leq p$. Now recall that $A_a = zA_0^{**}$, for a central projection $z \in A_0^{**}$ and that A_0 could be identified with $zA_0 \subseteq A_a$. Therefore, replacing p with zp , we may assume that $p \in A_a$. Hence $idl(a) \subseteq idl(p) \subseteq K(A_0)$, and (5) follows. Next (3) follows from (5) and the fact that $K(A_0)$ is contained in any dense ideal of A_0 . $\square$

6. FINITE WEIGHT PROJECTIONS IN (QUASI) LOCAL ALGEBRAS

One of the most fascinating features of topological spaces is the interrelation between topology and measure theory (of the corresponding Borel σ -field). Recall that for a Radon (regular positive Borel) measure on a topological space (like Haar measure on locally compact topological groups), we have that open sets and compact sets have non zero and finite measure, respectively. Also the whole space (in the case of a topological group) has infinite measure, unless it is compact. In non commutative topology, the *weights* are analogues of Radon measures. Finite weight projections of W^* -algebras are studied, among others by H. Halpern, V. Kaftal, and L. Zoido [HKZ]. Here we consider the problem in the setting of (quasi) local algebras.

Let's start with a brief introduction to the weight theory. Let M be a W^* -algebra and ϕ be a faithful normal semifinite (fns) weight on M . Let $\mathcal{N}_\phi = \{x \in M : \phi(x^*x) < \infty\}$ and $\mathcal{M}_\phi = \text{span} \mathcal{N}_\phi^* \mathcal{N}_\phi$. Then $\mathcal{N}_\phi$ is a left ideal of M and $\mathcal{M}_\phi$ is weakly dense in M .

Now consider the situation where there is a C^* -algebra A_0 such that $M = A_a = zA_0^{**}$, and ϕ is the extension of a trace ϕ_0 on A_0 to a fns tracial weight on A_a (as before, A_0 , being identified with zA_0 , is a C^* -subalgebra of A_a). We want to show that (relatively) compact projections in A_a have finite weight. We start with a lemma which is of independent interest.

The following lemma is a classical result. The proof presented here is communicated to us by Professor C. Akemann.

Lemma 6.1. *For each $p \in Proj_{cp}(A_a)$ there exists $q \in Proj_{ro}(A_a)$ such that $p \leq q$.*

Proof Let $a \in A_0$ be such that $p \leq a$. Take $f \in C[0, 1]$ such that $0 \leq f \leq 1$, $f = 0$ on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$, and $f(1) = 1$. Put $b = f(a)$ and let $q = [b]$ be the range projection of b , then q is open, $p \leq q$ and $\bar{q}$ is compact. $\square$

Lemma 6.2. *If $a \in A$ and $ap = a$ for some $p \in \text{Prj}_{cp}(A_a)$ then $a \in A_{00} = K(A_0)$.*

Proof We may assume that $a \in A_0^+$. Since p is compact, there is $b \in A_0^+$ such that $bp = p$. Hence $ba = b(ap) = b(pa) = (bp)a = pa = a$, hence $a \in K(A_0)$. $\square$

Lemma 6.3. *If $p \in \text{Prj}_{cp}(A_a)$ then there is $a \in K(A_0)$ with $ap = p$.*

Proof Let q be as in Lemma 6.1. By Akemann-Urysohn lemma [Ake70, thm I.1], there is an $a \in A_0^+$ such that $a(1 - q) = 0$ and $ap = p$. Now $a\bar{q} \geq aq = a$ and $\bar{q} \leq 1$, so $a\bar{q} = a$ and Lemma 6.2 applies. (An alternative proof goes as: Let b be as in Lemma 6.2, then $b \in K(A_0)$ and $p \leq b$).

Next result is an analogue of the classical fact that compact sets have finite Borel measure.

Corollary 6.1. *With the above notation,*

1. $\text{Prj}_{cp}(A_a) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\phi$,
2. $A_p^a \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\phi$ ($p \in \text{Prj}_{cp}(A_a)$).

Proof Let $p \in \text{Prj}_{cp}(A_a)$. By Lemma 6.3 there is $a \in A_{00}$ such that $ap = p$. Then since $A_{00} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\phi_0}$ [Ped66, III], hence $aa^* \in A_{00} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\phi_0} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\phi$, and so $a^* \in \mathcal{N}_\phi$. But this is a left ideal of A_a and we get $p = ap = pa^* \in \mathcal{N}_\phi$. Now $p^*p = p$, so $p \in \mathcal{M}_\phi$. Also, using the fact that $\mathcal{N}_\phi$ is a left ideal of A_a again, we get $A_p^a = pA_ap \subseteq \mathcal{N}_\phi$, from which (2) implies. $\square$

We don't know if the above result holds when ϕ is not a trace. The only place which needs the tracial property is the inclusion $A_{00} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\phi_0}$. It is known that the canonical weight on a group algebra $C^*(G)$, for G a discrete infinite group, obtained by evaluation at the identity, fails to have this property [Pdr]. (Note that the Haar weight of $C_r^*(G)$ is a trace in this case.)

We show this is the case, however, under some conditions, for the case that A_a is either *finite* or *semifinite* and *properly infinite* (see [Dix] for definitions). For this purpose we use a deep result of Halpern, Kaftal, and Zoido [HKZ, thm1] which asserts that if M is a properly infinite and semifinite W^* -algebra with no type I direct summand and $\text{Prj}(\mathcal{M}_\phi)$ is a *lattice*, then there is a central projection $e \in M$ such that M_{1-e} is finite and $\text{Prj}(\mathcal{M}_\phi(e)) = \text{Prj}(\mathcal{M}_\tau)$, where τ is the canonical trace.

Proposition 6.1. *Let A_0 be a W^* -algebra and ϕ be a faithful normal semifinite weight on A_a . Assume that either A_a is finite or properly infinite, semifinite. Also in the second case we assume that $\text{Prj}(\mathcal{M}_\phi)$ is a lattice. Then*

1. $\text{Prj}_{cp}(A_a) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\phi$,
2. $A_p^a \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\phi$ ($p \in \text{Prj}_{cp}(A_a)$).

Proof This follows from Corollary 6.1, and above mentioned [HKZ, thm 1]. $\square$

One of the reasons that we used pro- C^* -algebras was to "expand" the original C^* -algebra so that we can accommodate some unbounded elements. In the theory of W^* -algebras we usually come across such objects, which are mostly gathered in the set M^η of *affiliated* elements to M . But M^η is merely a set (with no apparent algebraic structure). It is desirable to have some algebras which contain interesting unbounded operators related to a W^* -algebra. The (quasi) local algebras are one candidate. One of the common cases where unbounded elements affiliated to a W^* -algebra come into the play is the Radon-Nykodym derivative of weights. Let

M be a W^* -algebra and ϕ, ψ be fns weights on M . Then there is a *cocycle* u_t in M with

$$\begin{aligned} u_{t+s} &= u_t \sigma_t^\phi(u_s) \\ \sigma_t^\psi(x) &= u_t \sigma_t^\phi(x) u_t \end{aligned}$$

for each $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in M$ [Con]. (See next section for more details about σ_t^ϕ). Moreover, if $\phi = \phi \circ \sigma_t^\phi$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$), then this cocycle is a one parameter group of unitaries in the *fixed algebra* $M^\phi = \{x \in M : \sigma_t^\phi(x) = x \text{ } (t \in \mathbb{R})\}$. Then Stone's theorem will provide us a positive self-adjoint operator h affiliated with M^ϕ such that $u_t = h^{it}$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$). Put $h_\varepsilon = h(1 + \varepsilon h)^{-1}$, then $h_\varepsilon \in M^\phi$ and

$$\psi(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \phi(h_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} x h_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) \quad (x \in M^+)$$

We write $\psi = \phi(h_\cdot)$ and call h the *Radon-Nykodym derivative* of ψ with respect to ϕ [PT] and is denoted by $\frac{d\psi}{d\phi}$. If $\psi \leq \phi$ then $0 \leq h \leq 1$. If $\sigma_t^\psi = \sigma_t^\phi$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then h is affiliated with $Z(M)$.

Now let $M = A_a$ be the atomic W^* -algebra of a C^* -algebra A_0 . In this case, we show that h belongs to the quasi algebra of $A_0^{\phi_0}$. For $p \in \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_0)$, $\phi_p(pxp) = \phi(x)$ is a faithful, semifinite, normal weights on A_p^a . To avoid any confusion we need the following lemma. The proof is similar to Lemma 2.13 of [Am] and is omitted.

Lemma 6.4. $\text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a) = \text{Prj}_{ro}(A_a^\phi)$, and $(A_p^a)^{\phi_p} = (A_a^\phi)_p$ ($p \in \text{Prj}(A_a)$) . $\square$

Note that $\pi_{pq}^a((A_q^a)^\phi) \subseteq (A_p^a)^\phi$, hence we can form the corresponding inverse limit $A_{q\ell}^\phi = \varprojlim_p (A_a \phi)_p$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let ϕ, ψ be faithful, semifinite, normal weights on A_a such that $\phi = \phi \circ \sigma_t^\phi$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$). Then $\frac{d\psi}{d\phi} \in A_{q\ell}^\phi \subseteq A_{q\ell}$.*

Proof Let $h = \frac{d\psi}{d\phi} \eta M^\phi$, then we know from the construction that $h = xy^{-1}$ for some $x, y \in M^+$ [PT, ??]. But, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $p \in \text{Prj}_{cc}(M)$, $(\varepsilon + py)^{-1} \in M_p$, so as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we get $(py)^{-1} \in (M_p^\phi)^\eta = M_p^\phi$, by [Am, lem 2.13]. Hence $y^{-1} \in M_c^\phi$ and so does h . $\square$

7. LOCAL STRUCTURE OF KAC ALGEBRAS

Let M be a W^* -algebra and $M \bar{\otimes} M$ be the *von Neumann algebra tensor product* of M with itself. Let $\delta : M \rightarrow M \bar{\otimes} M$ be a *normal* injective unital $*$ -homomorphism which is *co-associative*, that's $(id \otimes \delta)\delta = (\delta \otimes id)\delta$. Let $\kappa : M \rightarrow M$ be a unital involutive anti-automorphism such that $\delta\kappa = \varsigma(\kappa \otimes \kappa)\delta$, where $\varsigma : M \bar{\otimes} M \rightarrow M \bar{\otimes} M$ is the canonical *flip*. Finally let $\phi : M^+ \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a faithful, semifinite, normal weight on M . Put

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_\phi = \{x \in M : \phi(x^*x) < \infty\}.$$

This is a left ideal of M , which is also a *pre-Hilbert space* under the inner product

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \phi(y^*x) \quad (x, y \in \mathcal{N}_\phi).$$

Let H_ϕ be the Hilbert space completion of $\mathcal{N}_\phi$. We identify $\mathcal{N}_\phi$ with a subspace of H_ϕ . Then $\mathcal{A}_\phi = \mathcal{N}_\phi \cap \mathcal{N}_\phi^*$ is dense in H_ϕ . $\mathcal{A}_\phi$ is a *left Hilbert algebra* under the multiplication and involution of M . Also the involution of $\mathcal{A}_\phi$ is a *preclosed* mapping in H_ϕ . Let $S_\phi \in C(H_\phi)$ be its closure and consider the *polar decomposition*

$S_\phi = J_\phi \Delta_\phi^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where $J_\phi : H_\phi \rightarrow H_\phi$ is a anti-linear isomorphism, and Δ_ϕ is a positive operator, called the *modular operator*. Moreover, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\Delta_\phi^{it} M \Delta_\phi^{-it} = M$, and so we get a one parameter group of automorphisms of M which is called the *modular automorphism group* defined by

$$\sigma_t^\phi(x) = \Delta_\phi^{it} x \Delta_\phi^{-it} \quad (x \in M, t \in \mathbb{R})$$

We have

$$\phi = \phi \circ \sigma_t^\phi.$$

Now $id \otimes \phi$ is a vector valued weight, which could be easily checked that it is faithful, semifinite, and normal. Let $\mathcal{N}_{id \otimes \phi}$ be the corresponding left ideal of $M \bar{\otimes} M$, then we say that ϕ is a *left Haar weight* if it satisfies the following conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\mathcal{N}_\phi) &\subseteq \mathcal{N}_{id \otimes \phi} \\ (id \otimes \phi)((1 \otimes y^*)\delta(x)) &= \kappa((id \otimes \phi)(\delta(y^*)(1 \otimes x))) \quad (x, y \in \mathcal{N}_\phi) \\ \kappa \sigma_t^\phi &= \sigma_{-t}^\phi \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Then ϕ is *left invariant* in the sense that

$$(id \otimes \phi)\delta(x) = \phi(x)1 \quad (x \in M^+).$$

Under the above conditions $K = (M, \delta, \kappa, \phi)$ is called a *Kac algebra*. Also δ, κ, ϕ are called the *co-product*, *co-inverse* and *Haar measure* of K , respectively.

Two classical examples of Kac algebras are the *commutative* and *co-commutative* Kac algebras $K_a = (L^\infty(G), \delta_a, \kappa_a, \phi_a)$ and $K_s = (\mathcal{L}(G), \delta_s, \kappa_s, \phi_s)$, where G is a locally compact topological group, $L^\infty(G)$ is the algebra of all *essentially bounded* complex functions on G , and

$$\mathcal{L}(G) = \{\lambda(f) : f \in L^1(G)\}''$$

is the *(left) group von Neumann algebra* of G , and the other ingredients are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_a(f)(s, t) &= f(st), \quad \delta_s(\lambda(g)) = \lambda(f) \otimes \lambda(f) \\ \kappa_a(f)(s) &= \tilde{f}(s) = f(s^{-1}), \quad \kappa_s(\lambda(g)) = \lambda(\tilde{g})^* \\ \phi_a(f) &= \int_G f(s) ds, \quad \phi_s(h) = h(e) \end{aligned}$$

where $f \in L^\infty(G)$, $g \in L^1(G)$, and $h \in L^1(G) \cap L^2(G)$.

In this section we want to introduce the analogs of *local neighborhoods* for Kac algebras. In the previous sections we observed that (open) projections can play this role for us. One should note however that these concepts were defined in the context of *atomic* W^* -algebras. It is possible to associate an atomic W^* -algebra to each Kac algebra K (it would be a quotient of $W^*(K)$ in the notation of [ES]), but there is a more suitable (and natural) way to handle this. Starting with a C^* -algebra A_0 , one main reason that the non commutative topology works is the fact that there is an isometrically isomorphic copy of A_0 in its atomic W^* -algebra zA_0^{**} [Pd72, 3.8]. Now we have a similar situation in Kac algebras, namely given a Kac algebra $K = (M, \delta, \kappa, \phi)$, let $A_0 = C_r^*(\hat{K})$ be the C^* -algebra completion of $\hat{\lambda}(\hat{M}_*)$ [ES]. Then $A_0 \subset M$ has the same norm. We define the concepts of non commutative topology in this framework and show that we have plenty of open, closed, and compact projections inside M .

In what follows we freely use the notations and terminology of [ES]. Let $K = (M, \delta, \kappa, \phi)$ be a Kac algebra and $\hat{K}$ be its dual Kac algebra. Let $\hat{\lambda} : \hat{M}_* \rightarrow M \subseteq B(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{\phi}})$ be the Fourier transform of $\hat{K}$ and $A_0 = C_r^*(\hat{K})$ be the C^* -algebra completion of $\hat{\lambda}(\hat{M}_*)$. Then $A_0 \subseteq M = \hat{\lambda}(\hat{M}_*)''$, where the commutants are with respect to the Fourier representation. On the other hand, the inclusion map $j : A_0 \rightarrow M$ extends to a normal $*$ -homomorphism $j'' : A_0'' \rightarrow M''$, where the commutants this time are with respect to the universal representations. But then A_0'' is the same as the second dual A_0^{**} [Sak, 1.17.2], and $M'' = M$. Let $I = \ker(j'')$, then I is a *weak**-closed two sided ideal of A_0^{**} , so there is a central projection $w \in A_0^{**}$, such that $I = (1 - w)A_0^{**}$.

Lemma 7.1. *With the above notations, $M \simeq wA_0^{**}$, as W^* -algebras. Indeed the restriction of j'' to wA_0^{**} is injective and so an isomorphism. Also the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_0 & \xrightarrow{j} & \omega A_0 \\ \downarrow i & & \downarrow \\ M & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \omega A_0^{**} \end{array}$$

where the top map is the $*$ -homomorphism which sends $a \in A_0$ to wa and i and j are the inclusion maps.

Proof The first statement follows from the fact that j'' is surjective (since $M = \hat{\lambda}(\hat{M}_*)''$) and that $\ker(j'') = (1 - w)A_0^{**}$. To see that the diagram commutes, take any $a \in A_0$, then this is sent to $wa \in wA_0^{**}$ in the top route. Now j'' is a unital homomorphism so $j''(1) = w$. Also $j''(a) = j(a) = a$, therefore the isomorphism on the bottom (which is the inverse of the restriction of j'' to wA_0^{**}) sends a to wa and the diagram commutes. $\square$

Given $x \in M$ and $J \subseteq M$, following [GK], we put

$$e(x) = \wedge \{p \in \text{Prj}(M) : xp = x\} \quad \text{and} \quad e(J) = \vee \{e(x) : x \in J\}.$$

Then $e(x)$ and $e(J)$ are projections in M . Similarly we define central projections $z(x)$ and $z(J)$ in M by

$$z(x) = \wedge \{p \in \text{Prj}_{cn}(M) : xp = x\} \quad \text{and} \quad z(J) = \vee \{z(x) : x \in J\}.$$

Definition 7.1. Let $K = (M, \delta, \kappa, \phi)$ be a Kac algebra and $A_0 = C_r^*(\hat{K})$. A projection $e \in \text{Prj}(M)$ is called open if there is a set $J \subseteq A_0$ such that $e = e(J)$. It is called closed if $1 - e$ is open. Also $e \in \text{Prj}(M)$ is called relatively compact if there is $a \in A_0$ such that $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and $e \leq a$. Finally a closed relatively compact projection is called compact. We denote the set of open, closed, relatively compact, and compact projections of M by $\text{Prj}_{op}(M)$, $\text{Prj}_{cl}(M)$, $\text{Prj}_{rc}(M)$, and $\text{Prj}_{cp}(M)$, respectively. We also freely use the abbreviations of Notation ?? in this context.

Next we show that there are plenty of open (and so closed) projections in M . The few next results are already proved in [GK] in a different context (where $M = zA_0^{**}$). We give detailed proofs here, with some slight modifications when needed, to make sure they work in our context. In what follows $K = (M, \delta, \kappa, \phi)$ is a Kac algebra and $A_0 = C_0(K) \subseteq M$.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $a \in A_0$ be self adjoint and $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be open. Let*

$$a = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s dE(s)$$

be the spectral decomposition of a and put $e = \int_U dE(s)$. Then $e \in \text{Prj}_{op}(M)$. Moreover if U has compact closure in $\mathbb{R}$, then e is relatively compact .

Proof e is clearly a projection . The fact that $e \in M$ follows from the fact that $E(s) \in M$ for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$ [Sak, 1.11.3]. Take any $f \in C(\mathbb{R})$ such that $f = 0$ off U and $f > 0$ on U . Put $b = f(a)$. Then $b \in \tilde{A}_0$, the (minimal) unitization of A_0 .

Let's observe that $e = e(b)$. Indeed $b = f(a) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(s) dE(s)$ and $e(b)$ belongs to the W^* -algebra generated by b [Sak, 1.10.4] and so to the one generated by $\{E(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\}$. In particular $e(b) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(s) dE(s)$, for some bounded function g . By definition of $e(b)$ then we have $g^2 = g = gf$, which means that g is the characteristic function of a set containing U , and so by minimality, $g = \chi_U$ and $e(b) = e$.

Take any approximate identity (e_α) of A_0 consisting of positive elements. Then $b_\alpha = b^{\frac{1}{2}} e_\alpha b^{\frac{1}{2}} \in A_0$, as A_0 is an ideal of $\tilde{A}_0$. Let's show that $\vee e(b_\alpha) \leq e(b) = e$. Let $p \in \text{Prj}(M)$ and $bp = 0$, then $(b^{\frac{1}{2}} p)^* (b^{\frac{1}{2}} p) = 0$ and so $b^{\frac{1}{2}} p = 0$ which implies $b_\alpha p = 0$, for each α , which means $\vee e(b_\alpha) \leq e(b)$. Conversely, if $b_\alpha p = 0$, for each α , then by the fact that $e_\alpha \rightarrow 1$ and $b_\alpha \rightarrow b$ in weak-operator topology [Sak, 1.7.4], and that multiplication of M is separately weakly continuous, we get $bp = 0$, and so $e(b)p = 0$, which means that $e(b) \leq \vee e(b_\alpha)$. Therefore $e = e(b) = \vee e(b_\alpha) = e(\{b_\alpha\})$ is open.

Finally if U is relatively compact in $\mathbb{R}$, then we can choose a function $g \in C_{00}(\mathbb{R})^+$ such that $0 \leq g \leq 1$ and $g = 1$ on U , then $c = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(s) dE(s) \in A_0$ satisfies $0 \leq c \leq 1$ and

$$e = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_U(s) dE(s) \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(s) dE(s) = c. \quad \square$$

For each $e \in \text{Prj}(M)$ let's consider

$$L(e) = \{a \in A_0 : ae = a\},$$

which is a norm-closed left ideal of A_0 , and note that $ae = a$ iff $e(a) \leq e$, for each $a \in A_0$, therefore

$$L(e) = \{a \in A_0 : e(a) \leq e\} = \{a \in A_0 : e(a^*a) \leq e\}.$$

Recall that for a projection e , the *interior* e° of e is defined by $e^\circ = \vee \{p \in \text{Prj}_{op}(M) : p \leq e\}$. The *closure* $\bar{e}$ of e is defined similarly. Next let's observe that $L(e) = L(e^\circ)$, for each $e \in \text{Prj}(M)$. Indeed, for each $a \in L(e)$, $e(a) \leq e$, and so $e(a) \leq e^\circ$, as $e(a)$ is open. Hence $L(e) \subseteq L(e^\circ)$. The converse follows from $e^\circ \leq e$.

Next, for each $a \in L(e^\circ)$, $e(a) \leq e^\circ$, so $e(L(e^\circ)) \leq e^\circ$. Also e° is open, so $e^\circ = e(J)$, for some $J \subseteq A_0$, but then $J \subseteq L(e^\circ)$ (by definition of $e(J)$) and so $e^\circ \leq e(L(e^\circ))$. Therefore

$$e(L(e)) = e(L(e^\circ)) = e^\circ.$$

Lemma 7.2. *With the above notation, TFAE:*

1. *For every closed left ideal L of A_0 , $e(L) = 1$ implies $L = A_0$,*
2. *For every maximal closed left ideal J of A_0 , $L(e(J)) = J$.*

Proof If (1) holds and J is maximal, then for each $x \in J$ we have $x \leq e(J)$ and so $x \in L(e(J))$, by definition, i.e. $J \subseteq L(e(J))$. Hence, by maximality, either $J = L(e(J))$ or $L(e(J)) = A_0$. But the second equality implies that $e(J) = 1$, and so $J = A_0$, by (1), which is a contradiction. Conversely, if (2) holds, and L is a closed left ideal with $e(L) = 1$ but $L \neq A_0$, then there is a (proper) maximal ideal $J \supseteq L$. Then $e(J) \geq e(L) = 1$, and so $e(J) = 1$, which implies by (2) that $J = L(e(J)) = L(1) = A_0$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Definition 7.2. Let $K = (M, \delta, \kappa, \phi)$ be a Kac algebra and $A_0 = C_r^*(\hat{K})$. We say that K satisfies condition (D) if any of the equivalent conditions of above lemma holds.

The above lemma is one of the departure points of our theory and the Akemann-Giles non commutative topology. In their context the condition (D) is automatically satisfied as their W^* -algebra is atomic. For Kac algebras, however, this condition does not hold in general even for the commutative case. If $M = L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ then $A_0 = C_0(\mathbb{R})$, and we have an uncountable number of distinct maximal closed ideals of A_0 whose support is 1, namely the ideals

$$J_x = \{f \in C_0(\mathbb{R}) : f(x) = 0\} \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}).$$

However, if we replace $\mathbb{R}$ with $\mathbb{R}_d$ ($\mathbb{R}$ with the discrete topology) then we get $e(J_x) = 1 - \delta_x$ and condition (D) is satisfied. This is indeed true for any discrete Kac algebra. Recall that a Kac algebra $K = (M, \delta, \kappa, \phi)$ is called *discrete* if the Banach algebra M_* is unital [ES].

Lemma 7.3. Any discrete Kac algebra satisfies condition (D).

Proof If $K = (M, \delta, \kappa, \phi)$ is discrete, then M is an atomic W^* -algebra [ES, 6.3.4] and we can apply the results of [GK] to our case. In particular, condition (D) follows from the proof of [GK, 5.5]. $\square$

Lemma 7.4. With the above notation

1. If J is a maximal closed left ideal of A_0 , then $1 - e(J)$ is a minimal closed projection (possibly zero) of M (i.e. it is closed and minimal among all closed projections),
2. If condition (D) holds, then for each closed left ideal L of A_0 , $L = L(e(L))$.

Proof We start by showing half of (ii). Given $x \in L \in \text{Idl}^\ell(A_0)$, we have $x \leq e(L)$, and so $x \in L(e(L))$, i.e. $L \subseteq L(e(L))$. Now to show (i), take any $f \in \text{Prj}_{\text{cl}}(M)$ such that $f \leq 1 - e(J)$, then $1 - f \geq e(J)$, and so $L(1 - f) \supseteq L(e(J)) \supseteq J$. By maximality, we get $L(1 - f) = J$. Hence $e(J) = e(L(1 - f)) = (1 - f)^o = 1 - f$, which proves (i). To prove (ii), assume that L is a closed left ideal with $L \neq L(e(L))$, then there is a maximal closed left ideal J of A_0 such that $J \supseteq L$ but $J \not\supseteq L(e(L))$. Given $a \in L$ we have $a \in J$, and so $ae(J) = a$, i.e. $a(1 - e(J)) = 0$. This holding for each $a \in L$, we get $e(L)(1 - e(J)) = 0$. But then $L(e(L))(1 - e(J)) = \{0\}$, by definition. Hence for each $x \in L(e(L))$, we have $x = xe(J)$ and so $x \in L(e(J))$. But $L(e(J)) = J$, by condition (D), therefore $J \supseteq L(e(L))$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Proposition 7.2. The map $e \mapsto L(e)$ is an order preserving injection of $\text{Prj}_{\text{op}}(M)$ into $\text{Idl}^\ell(A_0)$. Moreover, if K satisfies condition (D), this is a bijection.

Proof For $e, f \in \text{Prj}_{\text{op}}(M)$, then $e = e^o$ and $f = f^o$. Therefore if $e \leq f$, then $e(L(e)) \leq e(L(f))$, and so $L(e) \subseteq L(f)$. Also if $L(e) = L(f)$, then $e = e(L(e)) =$

$e(L(f)) = f$. To show that this map is onto, if K satisfies condition (D), we only need to observe that in this case, $L = L(e(L))$, for each $L \in \text{Idl}^\ell(A_0)$, by above lemma. $\square$

Corollary 7.1. *The map $e \mapsto L(e)$ is an order preserving injection of the set $\text{Prj}_{co}(M)$ of all central open projections of M into $\text{Idl}(A_0)$. Moreover, if K satisfies condition (D) this is a bijection.* $\square$

As we pointed out earlier the compact projections in non commutative topology do not behave in some cases like the characteristic functions of compact sets in the commutative case. For instance an Akemann's compact projection p could be majorized by a union of open projections where non of its finite subunions could majorize p (think of a rank one projection covered by union of rank one projections). Giles and Kummer showed that this pathology doesn't occur in the *compact* case [GK, 5.7]. We use a simplified version of their proof to show the implication (3) $\implies$ (4) in the following result.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $K = (M, \delta, \kappa, \phi)$ be Kac algebra. Consider the following conditions:*

1. K is compact, i.e. ϕ is finite,
2. $A_0 = C_r^*(\hat{K})$ is unital,
3. $1 \in \text{Prj}_{cp}(M)$,
4. (finite covering property) For each family $(e_i)_{i \in I}$ of open projections of M with $\bigvee_{i \in I} e_i = 1$, there is a finite subset $J \subseteq I$ such that $\bigvee_{i \in J} e_i = 1$,
5. (finite intersection property) For each family $(e_i)_{i \in I}$ of closed projections of M with $\bigwedge_{i \in I} e_i = 0$, there is a finite subset $J \subseteq I$ such that $\bigwedge_{i \in J} e_i = 0$.

Then (1) $\iff$ (2) $\iff$ (3) and (4) $\iff$ (5). Moreover, if K satisfies condition (D), then we have (3) $\implies$ (4).

Proof The If K is compact then the Banach algebra $\hat{M}_*$ is unital [ES, 6.2.5]. But $A_0 = C_r^*(\hat{K})$ is the C^* -completion of $\hat{M}_*$, so A_0 is also unital. Conversely, if A_0 is unital, then K is compact by the proof of [ES, 6.3.3]. Next we show that (2) and (3) are equivalent. If 1 is compact, then $1a = a$, for some $a \in A_0$, i.e. A_0 is unital. Conversely, if A_0 is unital, then $1 \in A_0$ is a compact projection of M . The equivalence of (4) and (5) is trivial.

Now assume that K satisfies condition (D), and that $1 \in A_0$ is compact. Then consider the left ideal $L = \sum_{i \in I} L(e_i)$. Then $e(L) \geq e(L(e_i)) = e_i^o = e_i$, for each i , and so $e(L) \geq \vee e_i = 1$. Hence $e(L) = 1$ and so $L = A_0$ by condition (D). In particular $1 \in L = \sum_{i \in I} L(e_i)$. Therefore there is a finite subset $J \subseteq I$ such that $1 \in L = \sum_{i \in J} L(e_i)$. Let $e_J = \bigvee_{i \in J} e_i$, then $e_J = 1e_J = 1$, and (4) is proved. $\square$

Acknowledgement: This paper is part of the author's Ph.D. thesis in the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign under the supervision of Professor Zhong-Jin Ruan. I would like to thank him for his moral support and scientific guidance during my studies.

REFERENCES

- [Ak69] C.A. Akemann ; The general Stone-Weierstrass problem for C^* -algebras . J. Functional Analysis 4(2) (1969) , 277-294.
- [Ake] C.A. Akemann ; Private Communication.
- [Am] M. Amini; Pro-Kac-algebras, preprint, Shahid Beheshti University, 2000.
- [AP] C.A. Akemann, G.K. Pedersen ; Complications of semicontinuity in C^* -algebra theory . Duke Math. J. 40(4) (1973) , 785-796.

- [APT] C.A. Akemann, G.K. Pedersen, J. Tomiyama; Multipliers of C^* -algebras . J. Functional Analysis 13(3) (1973) , 277-301.
- [AR] Z. Argün, K. Rowlands ; On quasi-multipliers . Studia Math. 108 (1994) , 217-245.
- [Cm] F. Combes ; Quelques proprietes des C^* -algebres . Bull. Sc. Math. 2^e serie 94 (1970) , 165-192.
- [Dav] E.B. Davis ; The structure of Σ^* -algebras . Quart. J. Math. Oxford, ser. 2 20 (1969) , 351-366.
- [Dix] Jacques Dixmier ; Les C^* -algebres et leurs representations, Gauttier-Villars , Paris, 1969.
- [ES] Michel Enock, Jean-Marie Schwartz ; Kac algebras and duality of locally compact groups, Springer-Verlag , Berlin, 1992.
- [Frg] M. Fragouloupoulou ; On locally W^* -algebras . Yokohama Math. J. 34 (1986) , 35-51.
- [GK] R. Giles, H. Kummer ; A non-commutative generalization of topology . Indiana Univ. Math. J. 21(1) (1971) , 91-102.
- [HKZ] H. Halpern, V. Kaftal, L. Zoido ; Finite weight projections in von Neumann algebras . Pac. J. Math. 147(1) (1991) , 81-121.
- [Ino] A. Inoue ; Locally C^* -algebras . Mem. Fac. Sci. Kyushu Univ. 25 (1971) , 197-235.
- [KV] Johan Kustermans, Stefaan Vaes; Locally compact quantum groups. Ann. Sci. cole Norm. Sup. (4) 33 (2000), no. 6, 837-934.
- [Lin] H.X. Lin; Support algebras of σ -unita C^* -algebras and their quasi-multipliers . Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 325 (1991) , 829-854.
- [LT] A. Lazar, D.C. Taylor; Multipliers of Pedersen's ideal . Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 169 (1976).
- [Ng] K.W. Ng ; Quasi-invariant measures in groups of second category . J. London Math. Soc. 7(2) (1973) , 171-174.
- [Pd64] Gert K. Pedersen; Measure theory for C^* -algebras , Ph.D. Thesis.
- [Pd66] Gert K. Pedersen; Measure theory for C^* -algebras $I - IV$. Math. Scand. 19 (1966) , 131-145; **22** (1968) 63-74; **25** (1969) 71-93; **25** (1969) 121-127.
- [Pd71] Gert K. Pedersen ; Atomic and diffuse functionals on a C^* -algebra . Pac. J. Math. 37(3) (1971) , 795-800.
- [Pd72] Gert K. Pedersen ; applications of *weak** semicontinuity in C^* -algebra theory . Duke Math. J. 39(3) (1972) , 413-430.
- [Pd79] Gert K. Pedersen ; C^* -algebras and their automorphism groups (1979) , Academic Press, 1979.
- [Pdr] Gert K. Pedersen ; Private Communication.
- [Ph88a] N.C. Phillips; Inverse limits of C^* -algebras . J. Operator Theory 19 (1988) , 159-195.
- [Ph88b] N.C. Phillips; A new approach to the multipliers of Pedersen's ideal . Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 104(3) (1988) , 861-867.
- [Ph88c] N.C. Phillips; Inverse limits of C^* -algebras and applications, Operator algebras and applications, Vol. 1, 127-185, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 135 (1988) , Cambridge Univ. Press , Cambridge-New York.
- [PT] G.K. Pedersen, M. Takesaki ; The Radon-Nikodym theorem for von Neumann algebras . Acta Math. 130 (1973) , 53-87.
- [Sak] Shōichirō, Sakai; C^* -algebras and W^* -algebras. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 60, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1971.
- [Sha] D.M. Shayadayeve ; On basic concepts of non-commutative topology . Czech. Math. J. 34 (1984) , 378-389.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SHAHID BEHESHTI, EVIN, TEHRAN 19839, IRAN,
M-AMINI@CC.SBU.AC.IR

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN, 106 WIGGINS ROAD, SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN, CANADA S7N 5E6, MAMINI@MATH.USASK.CA